DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 372 170 UD 030 013

AUTHOR Woods, Jerry
TITLE Chapter 1 Summer 1993 Programs. OER Report.
INSTITUTION New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, NY. Office of Educational Research.
PUB DATE 93
NOTE 55p.
AVAILABLE FROM Office of Educational Research, 110 Livingston Street, Room 740, Brooklyn, NY 11201.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Reports - General (140)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; *Basic Skills; *Compensatory Education; *Dropout Prevention; Elementary Secondary Education; Enrollment; *High Risk Students; Mathematics Skills; Numeracy; Reading Improvement; *Summer Programs; *Urban Education; Writing Improvement
IDENTIFIERS Education Consolidation Improvement Act Chapter 1; New York City Board of Education

ABSTRACT

This report presents evaluation information concerning a 1993 New York City Chapter 1 summer program's four components: Project Welcome Plus/Study Skills in Communication Arts (PWP/CA); the programs Basic Skills Academy/Comprehensive Competencies program and Auxiliary Service for High Schools Basic Skills; Basic Reading; and Project YOU. These programs were designed to target Chapter 1 students who were at risk of dropping out because they lacked basic skills. Student data revealed that some of the components met or surpassed their evaluation objectives while others did neither. Data evaluation includes the following findings: 75 percent of the students improved in their writing skills, surpassing the objective of 60 percent; both of the Basic Skills programs met their evaluation objectives for reading, writing, and mathematics improvements; almost three quarters of the Basic Reading program's students earned credit for a summer content-area course that exceeded the evaluation objective for this program; Project YOU failed to meet its evaluation objective, and only 28 percent of the students who completed this program improved their writing skills. Recommendations by the New York City Board of Education's Office of Educational Research conclude the report. (GLR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 372 170

OER Report

Chapter 1 Summer 1993 Programs

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
R. Tobias
NYC Public Schls
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Chapter 1 Summer 1993 Programs

NEW YORK CITY BOARD OF EDUCATION

Carol A. Gresser
President

Irene H. Impellizzeri
Vice President

Victor Gotbaum
Michael J. Petrides
Luis O. Reyes
Ninfa Segarra-Vélez
Dennis M. Walcott
Members

Andrea Schlesinger
Student Advisory Member

Ramon C. Cortines
Chancellor

9/13/93

It is the policy of the New York City Board of Education not to discriminate on the basis of race, color, creed, religion, national origin, age, handicapping condition, marital status, sexual orientation, or sex in its educational programs, activities, and employment policies, and to maintain an environment free of sexual harassment, as required by law. Inquiries regarding compliance with appropriate laws may be directed to Mercedes A. Nesfield, Director, Office of Equal Opportunity, 110 Livingston Street, Room 601, Brooklyn, New York 11201. Telephone: (718) 935-3320.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The 1993 Chapter 1 Summer program consisted of four discrete components, all funded by Chapter 1 monies. Each of the components targeted Chapter 1-eligible students who were at risk of dropping out of school because of their lack of basic skills. The four components were: Project Welcome Plus/Study Skills in Communication Arts (P.W.P./C.A.); the Basic Skills Programs, consisting of the Basic Skills Academy/Comprehensive Competencies program (B.S.A./C.C.P.) and the Auxiliary Service for High Schools (ASHS) Basic Skills program; Basic Reading; and Project YOU (Youth Opportunities Unlimited).

For each component, data were obtained from forms requesting relevant information on students' academic performance and attendance and from teacher questionnaires. Also, data were obtained from classroom observation forms used by evaluators during their visits to a sample of classes in each component, except Project YOU.

The student data revealed that some of the components met or surpassed their evaluation objectives while others did not. Seventy-five percent of the P.W.P./C.A. students improved in writing skills, which surpassed by a wide margin the program's evaluation objective that 60 percent of its students would improve. The P.W.P./C.A. program came close to but did not meet its attendance objective. Only 56 percent of the program students missed fewer than six days.

Both of the Basic Skills programs (B.S.A./C.C.P. and ASHS) met their evaluation objectives. Two-thirds of the B.S.A./C.C.P. students in reading classes and over three-fourths of those in mathematics classes increased 0.4 grade levels on the Test of Adult Basic Education (TABE). With 90 percent of the 18 English as a Second Language (E.S.L.) students in the B.S.A./C.C.P. gaining one level, the program exceeded by a large percentage its evaluation objective. In ASHS, about 61 percent of the students improved two grade equivalents in reading, writing, and mathematics, this also exceeded the evaluation objective.

Almost three-fourths of the Basic Reading program students earned credit for a summer content-area course, exceeding the evaluation objective for this program as well. Project YOU failed to meet its evaluation objective. Only 28 percent of the students who completed the program improved in writing.

Based on an analyses of the students' data forms, site supervisors' and teachers' questionnaires, and classroom observation reports, O.E.R. makes the following recommendations:

- Should funds become available, consideration should be given to providing trips and other incentives as possible ways of improving student attendance in Project Welcome Plus/Study Skills in Communication Arts;

- Teacher training sessions should emphasize and encourage accurate completion of all student data forms to obtain the data necessary to measure the programs' evaluation objectives;

- Both the summer program's orientation effort and the curriculum guide should be reviewed as they relate to writing remediation, particularly in consideration of the fact that the program's goal and evaluation objective were to improve its students' writing skills; and

- Program administrators should give consideration and attention to Basic Reading program teachers' suggestion that books be provided at the appropriate levels for students who are extremely deficient in reading skills and for foreign-born students.

- If portfolios are to be used at all, they should contain a reflective component and multiple drafts of students' work rather than serve merely as assignment folders. Further, portfolios should be used as an assessment tool for teachers.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This report was prepared by the Board of Education of the City of New York's Office of Educational Research/High School Evaluation Unit (O.E.R./H.S.E.U.) under the direction of Dr. Lori Mei. Special thanks to Ellie Zak for coordinating the overall evaluation, and to Jerry Woods for analyzing and interpreting the data and for writing the final report.

Additional copies of this report are available by writing to:

Dr. Lori Mei
Office of Educational Research
110 Livingston Street - Room 740
Brooklyn, New York 11201

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY		i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS		iii
I.	INTRODUCTION	
	Program Background and Structure	1
	Evaluation Methodology	9
	Scope of this Report	9
II.	CHAPTER 1 SUMMER PROGRAMS	11
	Project Welcome Plus/Study Skills in Communication Arts (P.W.P./C.A.)	11
	Basic Skills Programs	22
	Auxilliary Services for High Schools (ASHS)	25
	Basic Reading	28
	Project YOU (Youth Opportunities Unlimited)	32
III.	PROGRAM OUTCOMES	35
	Project Welcome Plus/Study Skills in Communication Arts (P.W.P./C.A.)	35
	Basic Skills Academy/Comprehensive Competency Program (B.S.A./C.C.P.)	37
	Auxiliary Services for High Schools (ASHS)	37
	Basic Reading Program	38
	Project YOU	38
IV.	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	39
	Objectives Met	39
	Overall	45

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Summary of Number of Days Attended by P.W.P./C.A. Participants	36

I. INTRODUCTION

PROGRAM BACKGROUND AND STRUCTURE

In 1982, the New York City Board of Education acknowledged that students who enter high school without the requisite basic skills are often frustrated by their inability to pass their course work and are therefore at risk of dropping out of school before graduation. In an attempt to address this complex issue, the Board of Education's Division of High Schools (D.H.S.) began a summer enrichment program designed to ease the transition from junior high and intermediate school into high school by providing a basic skills remediation program to low-achieving students during the summer before they enter high school. The program, then known as Preparation for Raising Educational Performance (PREP), was offered to all Chapter 1-eligible ninth and tenth grade students entering high school for the first time that September.* In 1987, as a result of its on-going assessment of students' needs, D.H.S. expanded the Chapter 1 summer program to include all Chapter 1-eligible high school students in need of basic skills instruction.

---

*Chapter 1 refers to a section of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act (E.C.I.A.) of 1981, a federal law intended to serve educationally disadvantaged students by providing funds to school districts that offer remedial programs designed to address student needs in basic reading, writing, mathematics and English-language proficiency. A school is eligible for Chapter 1 funds if its percentage of low-income students is equal to or greater than the citywide average based on a formula which calculates students' eligibility for free lunches and Aid to Families with Dependent Children (A.F.D.C.). Students are eligible for Chapter 1 programs if they score below the state reference points on standardized tests.

By 1993, the Chapter 1 funded summer program had evolved into four distinct program components targeted at the varied basic skills needs of Chapter 1-eligible students. The four components included: Project Welcome Plus/Study Skills in Communication Arts (P.W.P./C.A.);* Basic Skills Programs, which consisted of the Basic Skills Academy/Comprehensive Competency Program and the Auxiliary Services for High Schools (ASHS) Basic Skills Program; Basic Reading; and Project YOU (Youth Opportunities Unlimited).

Project Welcome Plus/Study Skills in Communication Arts (P.W.P./C.A.)

In 1993, P.W.P./C.A., in its initial year, was the largest component of the Chapter 1 summer program. While an enrollment of approximately 3,000 students was anticipated, 2,042 actually participated in this component. P.W.P./C.A. was designed to serve ninth and tenth grade Chapter 1-eligible students who would be entering high school in the fall semester. This program had the broad objective of easing the transition from junior high to high school for students who were potentially at risk of dropping out of school. It had a dual approach, with foci on introducing

---

*The Division of High Schools initiated the Project Welcome Plus/Study Skills in Communication Arts (P.W.P./C.A.) component in the summer of 1993, and discontinued the Institute for Career Exploration (ICE), which was the largest component of the Summer 1992 Chapter 1 program. A discussion of the ICE program is included in the Summer 1992 Chapter 1-funded programs report titled Chapter 1-Funded Summer Programs: Institute for Career Exploration (ICE), the Basic Skills Programs, the Basic Reading Program, and Project You (Youth Opportunities Unlimited), available from the Office of Educational Research/High School Evaluation Unit.

students to high school-level academic work in communication arts, and on social aspects (e.g., improving self-esteem and resolving conflict) of the transition. The P.W.P./C.A. component is related to, but independent from, a program with similar objectives and name, Project Welcome,* which is conducted during the academic year.

Students were selected for participation in the P.W.P./C.A. component on the basis of test scores. First-time high school entrants to ninth or tenth grade were eligible if their reading scores fell below the 50th percentile on the Degrees of Reading Power (D.R.P.) test, or a comparable reading test, or below the 41st percentile on the Language Assessment Battery (LAB) test, a test of English language skills.

The program was in session for 30 days (six weeks), from Friday, July 2nd, through Friday, August 13th. Classes were held in 29 high schools throughout the five boroughs. Students could be scheduled Monday through Friday for two 90-minute courses: a P.W.P./C.A. class, with a maximum enrollment of 25 students, and a regular content-area class.

The P.W.P./C.A. course was designed to include an orientation to high school, training in study skills, writing remediation, self-assessment, training in setting personal goals,

---

*Project Welcome, a collaborative effort on the part of New York City high schools and their primary feeder schools to provide a series of supportive activities to ease students' transition from junior to senior high school, was initiated in 1990. Several evaluation reports on Project Welcome are available from the Office of Educational Research (O.E.R.).

clarification of values in the consideration of a career choice, and training in conflict resolution. Each student was expected to develop a portfolio to contain his or her daily journal writing and other written materials. The regular tax-levy course was designed to allow teachers to utilize varied instructional strategies and techniques so as to provide the necessary support for their particular students to experience success.

Credit was given for the content-area class, but no credit was given for the P.W.P./C.A. class. Tax-levy funds paid for the content-area classes, while Chapter 1 provided funding for the P.W.P./C.A. classes. Chapter 1 funds also paid for educational paraprofessionals, student mentors, and staff development specialists to provide support services for the P.W.P./C.A. classes.

The overall goals of P.W.P./C.A. were to encourage students to regularly attend classes and to improve their writing skills through the integration of writing activities with an orientation to high school and with self-assessment and goal-setting, career exploration, study skills, and conflict resolution activities. The objectives were that:

- sixty percent of the students will improve their writing skills based on holistically scored pretest and posttest writing samples; and
- sixty percent of the students will meet the attendance requirement for the summer program, so that they are not denied credit for their second course (tax-levy) due to lack of attendance.*

---

*Students absent for six or more days of the 30-day program may not receive credit for work completed in the course.

Basic Skill Programs

Chapter 1 funds were used for two basic skills program components in 1993: the Basic Skills Academy/Comprehensive Competencies (B.S.A./C.C.P.) program, and the Auxiliary Services for High Schools (ASHS) Basic Skills program. While these components both offered remedial classes, they targeted different student populations.

B.S.A./C.C.P. This program provided skills development classes in reading, mathematics, and English as a Second Language (E.S.L.). Students were eligible to participate in this program if they scored below the 50th percentile on the Degrees of Reading Power (D.R.P.) or a comparable reading test, or on the Metropolitan Achievement Test (MAT) for mathematics or a comparable mathematics test or scored below the 41st percentile on the Language Assessment Battery (LAB) test. Eligibility was not limited to incoming ninth and tenth graders. These criteria were the same as those used in the 1992 program. Instruction was individualized and computer-assisted. Students worked at their own pace and competency.

The objectives for the 1993 program were also the same as those in 1992:

- fifty percent of the students in the program will evidence an increase from pretest to posttest of 0.4 grade levels for reading and mathematics as determined by the Test of Adult Basic Education (TABE); and
- fifty percent of the students in the E.S.L. component will show a gain of one C.C.P. level.

B.S.A./C.C.P. was offered at three high schools: George Washington High School in Manhattan, Springfield Gardens High School in Queens, and Theodore Roosevelt High School in the Bronx. Enrollment was limited to 20 students per site, and classes were in session from July 2nd through August 13th, from 8:25 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. daily. Students were scheduled for a maximum of three, 90-minute periods per day, with a minimum requirement of 180 minutes of instructional time. For each school, Chapter 1 provided funds for two teachers and two para-professionals.

ASHS. This program targeted former dropouts returning to school, and potential dropouts functioning below grade level in reading, writing, and/or mathematics. The students were overage for their grade and lacked a majority of the credits required for graduation from high school. The 1993 program goal was to improve the reading, writing, and mathematics skills of program participants in order to enable them to continue their education. This goal was to be measured by one objective:

- sixty percent of the program participants will improve two grade level equivalents in reading, writing, and mathematics.

The 1993 program was offered at seven program sites,* and was in session from July 2nd through August 13th, from 8:55 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. daily. Class size was limited to 15 students.

---

* The 1993 program sites were: Tanzer Learning Center and Park Avenue Center in Manhattan; Roberto Clemente Center and Castle Hill Center in the Bronx; Linden Learning Center in Brooklyn; Jamaica Learning Center in Jamaica; and the St. George Center in Staten Island.

Students attended an equivalent of two 90-minute class periods per day. Classes varied in length depending on students' remedial needs. Teachers developed individual student progress plans based on results of the Metropolitan Achievement Test and the New York Arithmetic Computational Test for Mathematics. Because all instruction was individualized, students proceeded at their own pace.

Basic Reading

The Basic Reading component of the 1993 Chapter 1-funded summer program was offered at 15 high schools throughout New York City* and provided one-on-one instruction to students with very limited reading ability. The program was designed to pull students out of assigned classes or to provide instruction during a period the student was not assigned a class. The overall goal of the program was to provide individual reading remediation to non-readers, and thus support their efforts to pass their content-area courses. This goal was measured by one objective:

- fifty percent of the participants will receive credit for their summer course of study.

A high school student was identified as eligible for the program on the basis of his or her D.R.P. test score or on the basis of a comparable reading test score and teacher recommendations. Students with reading scores well below grade level were eligible for the program.

---

*These high schools included: George Washington, Julia Richman, Park West, and Seward Park in Manhattan; T. Roosevelt and Walton in the Bronx; Bushwick, Eastern District, Prospect Heights, Erasmus Hall, and George Wingate in Brooklyn; Jamaica, Springfield Gardens, and Flushing in Queens; and New Dorp in Staten Island.

In each of the schools that offered the program, one teacher was assigned a maximum of 15 students. Those students were identified by the home school and had a history of satisfactory attendance. Each teacher worked a three-period day and saw the same students daily over 30 days.

Project YOU

Project YOU, designed to address the needs of students who have court-related problems or who share many of the educational problems of such youngsters, and who lack basic skills, is an interim alternative education service. Thus, the ongoing overall goal of Project YOU is to place students in other educational settings within one year. The stated goal of the Chapter 1 component of the program, however, was to improve students' writing skills through integrated writing activities. The objective measure for obtaining this goal was that:

- fifty percent of the students who complete the program will improve their writing skills as measured by a comparison of pretest and posttest writing samples scored holistically by the teacher.

Project YOU was offered at four sites: Bushwick Youth Center, Mission at Theodore Roosevelt High School, Queens Center, and Pyramid Remand Center in the Bronx. All students enrolled in Project YOU were below grade level in reading. They were either already participants in the program during the regular school year or newly referred to it. Enrollment was limited to ten students per class. Classes were in session for three hours daily, from July 2nd through August 13th.

Project YOU instruction was remedial. Students were taught individually or in small groups. Emphasis was on basic and advanced skills in reading, writing, and mathematics in the content areas of English, science, social studies, and mathematics, with the purpose of enabling the students to meet success in a regular school year program in those areas.

EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The Office of Educational Research (O.E.R.) utilized three types of instruments to collect data in its evaluation of the 1993 Chapter 1 Summer programs: forms to record data on the participating students, site supervisor and teacher questionnaires, and classroom observation forms. The data retrieval forms and the questionnaires were sent to each Chapter 1-funded summer program school and site, requesting the appropriate information from each summer program supervisor and teacher. Instructions were provided to each location for the accurate completion and return of the data forms and questionnaires. O.E.R. evaluators utilized the classroom observation forms to record what they saw during their visits in July 1993 to 38 Chapter 1 summer program classes chosen at random in 14 high schools and three learning centers. O.E.R. determined the frequencies on the data on the returned student forms and staff questionnaires, and on the observation sheets, and performed the required content analysis on these data.

SCOPE OF THIS REPORT

This report examines the Chapter 1-funded summer programs in

1993. Chapter I describes the context for establishing summer programs, each of the 1993 components including their objectives, and the evaluation methodology used in the study. Chapter II discusses program implementation, and Chapter III reviews program outcomes. Chapter IV presents conclusions and recommendations.

II. CHAPTER 1 SUMMER PROGRAMS

PROJECT WELCOME PLUS/STUDY SKILLS IN COMMUNICATION ARTS (P.W.P./C.A.)

In 1993, O.E.R. evaluators observed 17 P.W.P./C.A. classes in 12 high schools. In addition to classroom observations, O.E.R. distributed two program questionnaires: one to P.W.P./C.A. teachers and the other to P.W.P./C.A. site supervisors. From a total of 34 schools, 38 teachers (95 percent) and 27 site supervisors (79 percent) returned the questionnaires.

Classroom Format and Activities

O.E.R. evaluators observed P.W.P./C.A. classes that were, for the most part, held in traditional classroom settings, with the students seated in rows facing the teacher at the front of the room. However, in several schools (Curtis, Wingate, Taft, and Westinghouse), students sat in seats arranged in circles for all or part of the class. Notable exceptions to the traditional classroom setting were the classes at Seward Park and Theodore Roosevelt High Schools, which were held in computer rooms although the computers were not used to assist instruction or learning, and a class at Bushwick High School, which was held in the library.

Based on the classes observed, either for the entire period or for a portion of it, the most common formats were teachers leading discussions (71 percent), students working individually (59 percent), teachers lecturing (47 percent), and students working in small groups (29 percent). Evaluators found that a student mentor or paraprofessional worked with individual

students in 18 percent of the classes. The teacher served as a moderator for dialogue among the students in only six percent of the classes.

O.E.R. evaluators also recorded the extent to which certain topics were covered or activities undertaken in the P.W.P./C.A. classes. The evaluators found that writing activities received some coverage in 71 percent of the classes. Introduction to high school-level work, discussion and activities related to high school-level work, and a focus on study skills were observed in 65 percent, 59 percent, and 53 percent of the classes, respectively. Only 47 percent of the classes gave any coverage to self-assessment and personal goals, 41 percent to training in conflict resolution, and 24 percent to career exploration activities.

Evaluators noted that folders were maintained for all of the students in the observed classes. The folders contained the students' journal and other written assignments and, in some cases, printed materials. However, for the most part, the observers found that the folders were not "portfolios." While there were some folders in which teachers had commented on students' work, usually providing very brief and limited remarks, there were none that indicated that students had commented on their own work. In addition, there was little evidence that students were involved in the selection of the work contained in their folders, and there were few classes with folders that contained multiple drafts of a single piece of writing by a student.

O.E.R. evaluators noted that nine (53 percent) of the 17 observed classes had a student mentor. In seven (78 percent) of the nine classes with mentors, the mentor distributed and collected materials or provided assistance to individual students, or both. One of the two mentors made only a brief comment during a class discussion, while the other did not take an active role in the class activities on the day observed.

Staff Background

Twenty-one (78 percent) of the 27 site supervisors who returned a questionnaire had served as an administrator in the ICE program in previous summers, and 16 (59 percent) had participated in the Project Welcome program in previous school years. Sixty-three percent of the site supervisors anticipated being involved with the Project Welcome program during the 1993-94 school year. The site administrators reported registries ranging from 21 to 285 students at their highest point.

Nearly two-thirds (61 percent) of the 38 teachers who returned a questionnaire taught English during the school year. Science, with three teachers (8 percent), had the next highest representation. Among the other subject areas represented were social studies, English as a Second Language (E.S.L.), reading, music, shop technology, home economics, and accounting. None of the teachers reported that they taught mathematics. Only one-third (32 percent) of the teachers had participated in Project Welcome during previous school years. Thirty-one teachers (82 percent) had previously taught in summer school.

Student Enrollment and Attendance

Site administrators reported that student enrollment was accomplished in a variety of ways. Seventeen (63 percent) of the site supervisors indicated that the feeder intermediate or junior high school was involved in student enrollment. Their involvement included facilitation of visits to the feeder school by the high school guidance counselor or articulation coordinator, distribution of Project Welcome Plus applications and other materials on the summer school program, and, in some instances, pre-registration of students. Approximately one-third (30 percent) of the supervisors reported that some combination of letters, telephone calls, and visits were used to enroll students. An equal percentage noted that test scores were utilized to determine enrollment.

Sixteen (59 percent) of the site supervisors said that they would change the enrollment procedures. Of those, seven (44 percent) felt that greater emphasis should be placed on feeder schools and their role in recruitment and in enrollment of Project Welcome students. Among the changes they suggested were that intermediate and junior high school staff should provide information to students about summer school beginning at the start of the eighth grade, exhibit greater cooperation and participation, and identify and recruit eligible students. Three supervisors said there should be a change in the testing procedures. They felt that the test scores received from the junior high schools were inaccurate or not current. Other

suggestions were that the program should be mandated for eligible students, that there should be a pre-registration during the last week in June, that student registration should be disallowed after June 30th, that list notices should be received earlier in the recruitment and enrollment process, that additional staffing should be provided to the high schools to test students, that instruction and supervisory staff assigned to organize the program should be given better orientation, and that some positive inducement should be offered to encourage students to enroll in and attend the program.

In regard to whether specific activities were used to urge students to attend P.W.P./C.A. classes, 96 percent of the site supervisors reported that their site made telephone calls to the students' homes; 70 percent provided additional guidance services; 33 percent offered special incentives, such as tee shirts and field trips and 19 percent utilized staff to visit students' homes. Site supervisors named telephone calls more often than any other activity as the one that worked best in urging students to attend P.W.P./C.A. classes. Other activities seen as the best for urging students to attend classes were special incentives, mailing letters to the students' homes, and the flexibility of the teacher in meeting the individualized needs of the students' mentors. Fewer than one-third (30 percent) of the site supervisors reported that they had activities (e.g., orientation or workshops) to involve parents in the summer program.

Teacher Orientation/Curriculum Guide

Both the site supervisors and teachers were asked about the teachers' orientation. Using a scale from one to five, with one indicating that the topic was "hardly mentioned" and five that it was "emphasized" in the curriculum, more than 90 percent of the site supervisors gave a rating of four or five to the topics of writing remediation (96 percent), rights and responsibilities (96 percent), orientation to high schools (93 percent), and study skills (93 percent). Career exploration received this rating from 88 percent of the supervisors, problem-solving from 86 percent, self-assessment and goal setting from 78 percent, test-taking strategies from 67 percent, and time management from 55 percent.

The majority of the 37 teachers who had received the Curriculum Guide rated it as either four or five (more than moderately useful) for helping them teach each topic, except for time management. Only 47 percent of the teachers gave this rating for time management. In fact, except for self-assessment and goal setting, each topic received high ratings from a smaller proportion of teachers than site supervisors.

For example 78 percent of the site supervisors felt that writing remediation was "emphasized" (the highest rating), but only 21 percent of the teachers reported that they thought the Curriculum Guide was "very useful" (the highest rating) for helping them prepare to teach writing remediation.

Program's Impact on Students

Site supervisors and teachers also indicated the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with the impact of P.W.P/C.A. and several of its aspects on student behavior and attitudes. Over three-fourths (78 percent) of the site supervisors, but less than three-fifths of the teachers (58 percent) agreed with the statement that the program will have a positive impact on dropout prevention, and nearly one-fourth (24 percent) of the teachers disagreed with the statement.

On each of the other statements on the impact of program efforts, a higher percentage of teachers than site supervisors agreed that there would be an impact on students. For example, three-fifths (61 percent) of the teachers but less than one-half (47 percent) of the site supervisors agreed that the focus on careers would have a real impact on students' attitudes toward schoolwork. Nearly three-fourths (71 percent) of the teachers and two-thirds (67 percent) of the supervisors agreed that the program's focus on self-assessment and personal goals would have a real impact on students' attitudes toward schoolwork. Over one-half (53 percent) of the teachers but less than one-half (48 percent) of the supervisors felt that the conflict resolution training would have a lasting impact on students' daily behavior.

Classroom Strategies and Instruction Aids

Thirty-seven (97 percent) of the teachers reported that they used writing folders for each student. This report corresponded with the observations of O.E.R. evaluators. While nearly all the

teachers used folders, slightly less than half (47 percent) indicated that they used portfolios. In their classroom observations, O.E.R. evaluators found an even smaller proportion of teachers whose folders could be classified as portfolios.

Ninety percent (34) of the teachers used journal writing, but only 21 percent (8) said that students used computers to assist them in their writing. Eighty-two percent (31) of the teachers used student-centered dialogue, 68 percent (26) used student presentations, and 45 percent (17) used debates in their classes. Among other strategies used by the teachers were role playing; group work, such as a student-produced newsletter; and lessons which utilized newspapers, skits, and book reports.

Usefulness of Paraprofessionals and Mentors

Over four-fifths (82 percent) of the teachers said that paraprofessionals were moderately or very useful in working with students. More than three-fourths gave the same evaluation of the student mentors' usefulness in working with students. Eight percent (3) of the teachers reported that the paraprofessionals were not useful, and six percent (2) indicated that the mentors were minimally or not useful in working with students.

Best Aspect of the Program

Eight (30 percent) of the site supervisors said that the curriculum or Curriculum Guide was the best aspect, or one of the best aspects, of the P.W.P./C.A. Collectively, they noted that the curriculum was highly structured for the teachers and well-received by the students, and that the Curriculum Guide had a

relevant curriculum for the students, including conflict mediation, problem solving, study skills, and self-evaluation training. Eight supervisors also thought that the orientation and socialization of students to the high school setting was the program's best aspect. For seven (26 percent) of the site supervisors, improvement in students' writing skills, which were developed as a result of the teachers' emphasis on and assessment of the students' writing exercises, was the best aspect of the program. Other aspects of the program which site supervisors identified as among its best were the availability of paraprofessionals and student mentors which aided in increasing student interaction; improvement in students' conflict resolution skills; small group work and individualized instruction; awarding of credit to students for another course in summer school which provided an incentive for them to attend classes; efforts by teachers to familiarize the students with the high school, including tours of the building; teachers' instructional strategies which were of a range suited for the students' different learning styles; cooperative learning activities and techniques provided students and the training given them to develop positive interpersonal relationships; and incentives, such as ice cream parties, field days, and movies.

As with the site supervisors, the largest number of teachers thought that the curriculum and the Curriculum Guide were the best aspects of the program. Nine (24 percent) of the teachers gave this response. In summary, these teachers reported

that the curriculum was diversified and interesting and provided the instructor with an abundant supply of materials to use to prepare students for high school. They felt that the Curriculum Guide supplied the teachers with daily activities which could be adopted for individualized or group work. Also, a few of these teachers reported that their students benefitted from the lessons on problem solving, conflict resolution, and career exploration. Five teachers each (13 percent) thought that the best aspects of the program were that it introduced students to high school materials and helped them to improve their self-awareness, particularly, to learn about themselves and their goals and to realize and express their strengths and weaknesses.

Problematic Aspects of the Program

Problematic aspects of the program for six (22 percent) of the 27 site supervisors were those related to recruitment. A specific recruitment problem which they identified was an insufficient effort, particularly at the eighth grade level, to register a larger number of students, and the necessity for the high school to work too hard to recruit students. Smaller numbers of site supervisors thought the following aspects of the program were problematic: incomplete student records provided by the junior high schools to the high school, including missing or inaccurate D.R.P. scores and student identification numbers; failure of some teachers or counselors to be assigned a position or be on the job at the beginning of the summer program; insufficient materials for the students; and too few incentives, such as trips, to motivate the students.

Problematic aspects of the program for six teachers (16 percent) were its failure to provide academic credit or any type of incentive to students for their completing the program. Among other aspects of the program that were problematic for smaller numbers of teachers were a poorly organized Curriculum Guide, insufficient time in a 90-minute class period to effectively utilize newspapers or complete the material in the Curriculum Guide, too few supplies, and too few Curriculum Guides.

Staff Suggestions for Improving the Program

Perhaps remembering their experiences with past summer programs that enjoyed higher levels of funding, more that one-half (52 percent) of the 27 site supervisors and over two-fifths (42 percent) of the 38 teachers suggested that providing trips for students would improve the program. Three site supervisors (11 percent) and five teachers (13 percent) said that the program could be improved by offering students incentives, such as certificates and tee-shirts, to attend the program. Among other suggestions by site supervisors for improving the program were that student participation in the program should be mandatory, feeder schools should inform their students that summer school participation is necessary, students should be given a full credit for successful completion of the program, feeder schools should send accurate reading scores to the high school so the high school could avoid having to administer the required tests, and a job placement component should be included in the program to attract students and serve as an incentive for them to

complete the program. Additional suggestions from teachers for improving P.W.P./C.A. were to invite appropriate people to speak to the students, provide better workbooks, for example, workbooks that incorporate more of the Curriculum Guide, send the Curriculum Guide to the program staff earlier, require all incoming ninth grade students to attend the program, and give an academic credit for successful completion of the P.W.P./C.A. course.

BASIC SKILLS PROGRAMS

To improve students' abilities in English and mathematics, the B.S.A./C.C.P. used a mastery learning prescriptive skills approach. Computer-assisted instruction was also available to students. First, skill levels were determined by administrating the Test of Adult Basic Education (TABE). Then, a skills profile --that is an individualized action plan which allowed the students to work at their own pace and competency--was developed for each student. Finally, the lessons that were assigned provided options which matched a range of individual learning needs, styles, and preferences. These lessons consisted of individually tailored sequences of skills-developed activities.

Registration for the program was on Thursday, July 1st. Classes were in session from Friday, July 2nd through Friday, August 13th, from 8:25 am to 1:00 pm daily. Students were scheduled for a maximum of three 90-minute periods. The program required a minimum of 180 minutes of instructional time each day.

Classroom Format and Activities

O.E.R. evaluators visited one reading class each at George Washington and Springfield Gardens high schools. They observed two classes, one reading and one mathematics, at Theodore Roosevelt High School. The evaluators noted that all students' instruction was individualized. Each of the classes utilized computers to assist instruction, although none of the students at Springfield Gardens worked on computers on the day that the O.E.R. evaluator observed the class.

In the B.S.A./C.C.P. classes observed by O.E.R. evaluators, teachers maintained folders on all the students. With the possible exception of the reading class at George Washington, the evaluators found little evidence that the folders could be classified as "portfolios." As in P.W.P./C.A. classes, folders containing students' work generally included very limited comments by teachers and no reflective statements by students about their work. At George Washington, the folders contained multiple drafts of a single piece of work and the teachers had made comments on their written assignments. Also, the evaluator felt that the folders included evidence that there was some selectivity of work, in the form of individual assignments selected according to the students' needs. However, none of the folders had written comments by the students on their own work; that is to say, there was no written indication that the students engaged in reflection on their work after its completion.

O.E.R. evaluators noted that each class had a para-professional in addition to a teacher. The observer of the class at George Washington High School reported that mentors were also present, and helped students with their individual assignments. The assistance of the mentors in that class was probably beneficial since it consisted of 23 students.

Staff Background

Six B.S.A./C.C.P. teachers returned questionnaires. Two each taught reading and mathematics, and two taught both reading and mathematics during the summer. All of the teachers reported that their students used printed materials and computer software. Four of the teachers noted that students in their classes also used audio-visual materials as a resource. Each of the teachers gave their students individually tailored assignments.

Tasks Performed by Computers

B.S.A./C.C.P. teachers utilized computers to perform several tasks. Eighty-three percent (5) used them for scoring students' work, 67 percent (4) for recording students' performance, 50 percent (3) for recording time students spent on tasks, and 33 percent (2) for providing assignments for their students.

Staff Perceptions of the Program's Effectiveness

Overwhelmingly, the teachers felt that the computer software used by the students was effective in motivating them, appropriate to their age and maturity level, relevant to tasks that needed to be accomplished, reasonably easy to use, and effective in improving students' skills in reading, mathematics,

or E.S.L. In reporting their views of the effectiveness of the program in general, six teachers (100 percent) thought that it was "very effective" in allowing students to work at their own level and providing them with individual assistance. Five of the six teachers thought the program was effective or very effective in each of the following areas: allowing students to work in their preferred style; motivating students to stay in school; improving students' skills in reading, mathematics, and E.S.L.; and tracking the progress of individual students. For each area, the remaining teacher was ambivalent about the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of the program.

B.S.A./C.C.P.'s Primary Accomplishments

B.S.A./C.C.P. teachers named a variety of accomplishments of the B.S.A./C.C.P. component. Among the most common were that the program motivated the students through individualized assignments and one-on-one and computer-assisted instruction, resulting in reduced frustration, fewer discipline problems, and increased attendance. A few teachers noted that the program raised reading and mathematics scores. Among the teachers' other responses was that the program increased students' self-esteem.

AUXILIARY SERVICES FOR HIGH SCHOOLS (ASHS)

The ASHS program was designed to provide one-on-one and small-group instruction to students who had dropped out or were considering dropping out of high school and were functioning below grade level in reading, writing, or mathematics. Also, the program was designed to have classes with a maximum of 15

students, working at their own pace, and which emphasized improvement in basic skills. O.E.R. evaluators visited the Fenzer, Roberto Clemente, and Jamaica Learning Centers and observed six classes, two at each site. Fifty-seven program teachers returned completed questionnaires.

Classroom Format and Activities

During all or a portion of the class period in five of the six observed classes, students worked on individual assignments. This was the only format in the mathematics class at Fenzer and in the two mathematics classes at the Jamaica Learning Center. In one of the classes at the Jamaica Learning Center, the teacher lectured for the entire class period. The number of students per class ranged from 5 to 21. Two classes exceeded the maximum of 15 students specified in the program's proposal.

Instructional Organization

Of the 57 teachers who returned questionnaires, 40 percent (23) had been teaching five years or more in the Basic Skills for Auxiliary Services for High School programs; only 12 percent (7) were in their first year in the program. Seventy-two percent (49) of the teachers developed individualized education plans for their students. Eighty-six percent kept individual folders listing the student's plan or goals in subject areas. Slightly more than one-half (30) were assisted by an educational paraprofessional. Included in the duties of about two-fifths of the paraprofessionals were grading tests, helping individual students, distributing materials, and checking assignments.

Available Resources

The teachers identified reading (81 percent) and mathematics (75 percent) workbooks most frequently as the resources available to them to aid students' instruction. Sixty-seven percent of the teachers reported that writing workbooks and mathematics textbooks were available for instruction while 58 percent reported that they had writing textbooks and the same percentage had readers available to aid instruction. Computers were available as an instructional resource to 14 teachers (25 percent).

Over three-fourths (77 percent) of the teachers gave the program materials a very good or higher rating for their appropriateness to the students' skills. Nearly three-fourths (74 percent) gave this rating to the materials, both for their ability to improve the students' basic skills and for their appropriateness to the students' age and maturity. Almost one-half (47 percent) of the teachers thought the materials were excellent for the age and maturity of the students. Two-thirds (63 percent) said the materials were at least very good for motivating the students to improve their skills.

Program Effectiveness

A large majority of the teachers reported that the ASHS program was effective in each of several areas. Ninety-five percent (54) said it was effective in improving students' confidence in their ability to obtain the General Education Diploma (G.E.D.), 88 percent (50) in motivating students to continue their education, 74 percent (42) in improving both basic

reading and basic mathematics skills, and 69 percent (39) in improving basic writing skills.

Primary Accomplishments

Approximately one-third of the program teachers reported that helping students prepare for, take, and pass the G.E.D. examination was their primary accomplishment. An equal proportion said that their primary accomplishment was helping students improve or acquire basic skills (e.g., reading, writing, mathematics). Among other primary accomplishments named by the teachers were helping students improve their self-confidence and motivating them to continue their education.

Suggestions for Improving the Program

The majority of the suggestions for improving the program involved the use of computers. Those suggestions included providing a budget to use for updating computer resources, increasing computer software, and providing separate rooms for traditional academic work and computer-assisted instruction because the students preferred not having computers nearby when working with written materials.

BASIC READING

Sixteen high schools offered the Basic Reading program as an addendum to regular summer school classes. The program was designed to provide "add on" or "pull out" instruction; that is, teachers either provided instruction when students were not assigned to a class or pulled students out of assigned classes.

Classroom Format and Activities

O.E.R. evaluators observed one class each at ten Basic Reading program sites: Bushwick, George Washington, George

Wingate, William Howard Taft, Jamaica, Park West, Seward Park, Springfield Gardens, Theodore Roosevelt, and Walton. Six of the observed classes were held in the school library, two in traditional classrooms, and two in the school computer lab. The number of students in a class ranged from two at Theodore Roosevelt to eight at Bushwick and Seward Park. Students working individually was the only or primary format for eight of the observed classes. In the other two classes the teacher lectured or led the class discussion. The students were engaged in a variety of activities, including reading books, utilizing the dictionary or thesaurus, and completing assignments on mimeographed worksheets. A folder was kept for each student in all the observed classes.

Reading skills was the topic that received the most extensive coverage in the ten observed classes. In eight of the classes, O.E.R. evaluators found that reading skills were covered from moderately to a great extent, with six of the classes receiving the higher rating for the topic. This was expected since the Basic Reading Program was designed to address the deficiencies of students with poor or limited reading skills. In the majority of the classes, writing activities were also covered moderately or to a great extent.

Twelve of the 16 Basic Reading program teachers responded to the O.E.R. teacher questionnaire. A range of 5 to 27 students was served by these teachers. At least one-third (4) of them had 16 or more students in their class. All of the teachers indicated that a reading test score was used to select students

for the program. Three-fourths (9) of the teachers reported that recommendations by the site supervisor were a consideration in student selection for the program, while two-thirds (8) cited recommendations by the summer school teacher, and one-half said that recommendations by the spring teacher were considerations in students' selection.

The questionnaire results showed that program teachers worked most often with groups of two to five students. Ten of the 12 teachers had at least one group of this size. Two of those teachers had two groups, and one had three groups of two to five students. Five teachers worked with groups ranging from six to nine students. Eleven (92 percent) of the 12 teachers worked with the same students every day. The other teacher noted that one group of students was met every day during the same class period, but that two other groups, consisting of students pulled out of other classes, varied and were met every other day. One teacher was scheduled during one period to work with only one student.

Eleven (92 percent) of the program teachers held their remedial sessions in the school library. The remaining teacher held remedial sessions in a classroom. That teacher felt that the classroom was more adequately supplied than the library and better suited for remediation of the students, most of whom were virtually non-readers. Teachers holding their remedial sessions in the library used the library in various ways as a resource to promote student interest in reading. Over 90 percent of the

teachers (11) noted that students used library books for recreational reading. Two-thirds (8) said that the students read magazines from the library collection for that purpose. In the classes of three-fourths (9) of the teachers, students chose books from the library collection for remediation. More than one-half (7) of the teachers chose remediation books for the students. Fewer than one-half (5) of the teachers had students use the library card catalogue or computer search system.

Teachers' Perceptions of the Program's Effectiveness

All of the teachers thought that the Basic Reading program had been effective or very effective in improving students' reading skills, promoting students' interest in reading, and improving students' confidence in their ability to achieve. In each of the following three areas, all but one teacher felt that the program had been effective or very effective: encouraging students to stay in school, improving students' ability to learn on their own, and facilitating students' academic achievement in their other summer courses. In the first two areas, the remaining teachers indicated that the program was not applicable to them; in the third area, the remaining teacher felt that the program had minimal effectiveness in helping students achieve in other summer courses. Two-thirds (8) of the teachers thought the program will be effective or very effective in facilitating students' academic achievement in the coming school year; more than one-half (7) gave the same rating to the program's effectiveness in teaching students library skills.

The teachers identified several and varied accomplishments of the program in the areas of helping students develop reading skills (e.g., comprehension, critical thinking, vocabulary, and syllabication), and improving students' self-confidence and self-esteem as a result of their reading successes and the individual attention given to them. Among the teachers' suggestions for improving future Chapter 1 Basic Reading programs were that the program provide books that are at a lower and/or an appropriate level, especially for foreign-born students and those with low reading levels, furnish all necessary reading materials (e.g., books, newspapers) or give teachers money to purchase them; and increase the number of participating students.

PROJECT YOU (YOUTH OPPORTUNITIES UNLIMITED)

Project YOU is an alternative program which provides interim educational services to students with court-related problems. Its overall program goal is to place students in other education programs within one year.

The focus of the 1993 Chapter 1 component of Project YOU was to improve the basic and advanced reading, writing, and mathematics skills of its participants. Students enrolled in the program were below grade level in reading. The program was designed to provide individualized or small group instruction to a maximum of ten students per class. Also, assignments were designed to provide skills that would enable students to achieve success in a regular school year program in the content areas of English, mathematics, science, and social studies. There were

four Chapter 1-funded sites in 1993: Bushwick, Mission, Pyramid, and Queens Center.

Program questionnaires were completed by three of the four program teachers. These data provided some information on the class organization, as well as on the program's perceived effectiveness.

Instructional Organization

Two of the three Project YOU teachers who responded to the questionnaire used group instruction and the other individual instruction as the primary method of teaching. Two developed individualized education plans for their students, and all three kept individual student folders. All of the teachers put students' work in the subject areas in the folders. Two of the teachers kept the students' goals and completed tests and quizzes in the folders. All the teachers were assisted by a para-professional. The duties of all the paraprofessionals included helping individual students, grading tests, and distributing materials. Two of the paraprofessionals' duties included checking students' assignments.

Available Resources

The teachers had various resources available to aid instruction. One had reading, mathematics, and writing workbooks; mathematics and writing texts; readers; and computers. Available to another were mathematics workbooks, worksheets, and Regents Competency Test (R.C.T.) booklets. The third teacher had only a science workbook, specifically geared to the preparation

of students for the science R.C.T. One teacher thought that the available materials were only fair to good as to their appropriateness to the students' skills, and two rated the materials as very good or excellent in terms of their appropriateness to the students' age, maturity, and skills; motivating students to improve their skills; and improving the students' basic skills.

Program Effectiveness

Two of the three teachers rated the project from moderately to very effective in improving basic reading, mathematics, and writing skills; motivating students to continue their education; improving students' ability to succeed in regular English, mathematics, science, and social studies courses; and improving students' confidence in their ability to obtain a general education diploma (G.E.D.).

Each teacher identified different primary accomplishments of Project YOU. One thought the primary accomplishment was the attempts made to motivate the students to further their interest in science. Another thought it was the resocialization of students. The third teacher reported that the primary accomplishments were that the students were helped to strengthen their basic skills and motivated to continue their mathematics education.

III. PROGRAM OUTCOMES

Based on available data, the extent to which each of the components of the Chapter 1 funded summer program met its evaluation objectives is reported here.

PROJECT WELCOME PLUS/STUDY SKILLS IN COMMUNICATION ARTS (P.W.P./C.A.)

O.E.R. obtained complete attendance data for 1,915 P.W.P./C.A. students. Table 1 shows that while nearly 14 percent (260) of the total number of students had perfect attendance, in all, only 56 percent (1,063) of the students attended the program 26 or more days. Consequently, the evaluation objective that at least 60 percent of the students would meet the attendance requirement for summer courses (i.e., be absent fewer than six days) was not achieved.

The second objective was to improve the writing skills of 60 percent of the P.W.P./C.A. students. This improvement was measured by an increase in score from pretest to posttest on writing samples scored holistically. O.E.R. received both pre-test and posttest writing scores on 1,545 P.W.P./C.A. students in 29 schools. This number represented 76 percent of the program's total register of 2,042 students. Of the 1,545 students whose pretest and posttest scores could be compared, 75 percent (1,152) improved their writing skills. While this percentage exceeded the evaluation objective by a large margin, the finding should be interpreted with some caution. Complete writing results were not obtained for nearly one-fourth of the students.

Table 1

Summary of Number of Days Attended
by P.W.P./C.A. Participants

Number of Days	Number of Students	Attendance Percent
1-25	852	44.5
26	109	5.7
27	246	12.8
28	236	12.3
29	212	11.1
30	260	13.6
Total	1,915	100.0

- The evaluation objective that at least 60 percent of participants would meet the attendance requirement of fewer than six absences was not met. Less than 56 percent of the students attended class for 26 or more days.

BASIC SKILLS ACADEMY/COMPREHENSIVE COMPETENCY PROGRAM (B.S.A./C.C.P.)

Forty-one students attended both B.S.A./C.C.P. reading and mathematics classes. Teachers reported both pretest and posttest TABE scores on 36 (88 percent) of the students in the reading classes and on an identical number and percentage of those in the mathematics classes. Of the 36 students in the reading classes with both pretest and posttest scores, 67 percent (24) increased 0.4 or more grade levels, while 78 percent (28) of those in the mathematics classes with such scores increased 0.4 or more grade levels. Therefore, the program surpassed the objective that 50 percent of the students would evidence an increase from pretest to posttest of 0.4 grade level for reading and mathematics as determined by the TABE test.

Another goal of the B.S.A./C.C.P. component was to provide appropriate E.S.L. instruction to enable the students to improve their speaking, reading, and writing skills in English. The specific objective was to have 50 percent or more of the students in the E.S.L. component show a gain of one C.C.P. level. B.S.A./C.C.P. teachers reported that 18 students were in the E.S.L. component and that 16 (89 percent) showed a gain of one C.C.P. level. Thus, students in the E.S.L. component easily surpassed the program objective.

AUXILIARY SERVICES FOR HIGH SCHOOLS (ASHS)

O.E.R. obtained data on whether students in the ASHS summer program in reading, writing, and mathematics improved two grade equivalents for 1,782 (99.2 percent) of the 1,796 participants.

Of the 1,782 students with complete data, 61 percent (1,079) improved two grade equivalents. Therefore, the program met the evaluation objective that at least 60 percent of the students in the summer program in reading, writing, and mathematics would improve two grade equivalents during the six weeks they were in school.

BASIC READING PROGRAM

The objective of the 1993 Basic Reading component of the Chapter 1 summer program was that 50 percent of the students would receive credit for a content-area course. Program staff reported credit information for 241 students. Of these 241 students, 175 (73 percent) earned credit for a course. This surpassed by far the program objective.

PROJECT YOU

O.E.R. received both pretest and posttest writing scores on 151 (87 percent) of the 174 students reported as having taken the Project YOU program. Of the 151 students for whom teachers provided pretest and posttest scores, only 43 (28 percent) demonstrated improvement on the posttest. Therefore, the program objective that 50 percent of the students would improve from pre-test to posttest was not met.

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Chapter 1 funds allow the New York City public schools to provide additional remedial classes to a variety of student populations identified as being at risk of failing and/or of dropping out of high school. These students lack the basic reading, mathematics, and language arts skills necessary to successfully complete content-area classes. They also frequently have attendance problems. By offering a summer skills improvement program, D.H.S. acknowledges that without intervention, low-achieving students might fail, become discouraged and might, in fact, drop out of school.

OBJECTIVES MET

An analysis of student data revealed that some 1993 Chapter 1 funded summer program components met their evaluation objectives while others did not. P.W.P./C.A. met one of its two evaluation objectives. Seventy-five percent of its students improved their writing skills--a percentage that was far higher than the 60 percent rate stipulated in the proposal. While this percentage exceeds by far the objective, some caution should be used in interpreting the finding. One-fourth of the program's students were not included due to incomplete test data. P.W.P./C.A. did not achieve its attendance objective, since only 56 percent of the students had fewer than six absences. The Basic Skills Programs (B.S.A./C.C.P. and ASHS) both met their evaluation objectives, while Project YOU failed to meet its objective that 50 percent of the students who completed the program would improve in writing.

P.W.P./C.A. Program

A majority of site supervisors thought that orientation to high school, rights and responsibilities of students, study skills, writing remediation, problem solving, test-taking strategies, time management, self-assessment and goal setting, career exploration and planning, and conflict resolution received more than a moderate level of emphasis during the teacher orientation. The teachers' questionnaire data revealed that the majority of teachers felt that the Curriculum Guide was more than moderately useful for helping prepare them to teach these topics although in nearly every instance this majority was smaller than that for site supervisors.

Nearly one-third of the site supervisors thought that the curriculum was the best aspect of the program. The same percentage of the supervisors said that orienting or socializing students to the high school setting were the program's best aspects, while one-fourth of the site supervisors thought that the best aspect of the program was improvement in students' writing skills. The largest percentage of teachers identified the curriculum or Curriculum Guide as the best aspect of the program.

The most problematic aspect of the program for site supervisors was the recruitment of students. Nearly one-fourth of the supervisors said there was an inadequate effort by the feeder schools to recruit students and/or that the high school had to work too hard to recruit them. Other aspects of the

program which some site supervisors found problematic were incomplete and inaccurate student records which they received from the junior high schools, not having some teachers or counselors assigned to a position or on the job at the beginning of the summer school session, not having sufficient materials for the students, and too few incentives to motivate the students. Teachers thought that failure to offer academic credit or any type of incentive to students who completed the program was the program's most problematic aspect.

About one-half of the site supervisors and two-fifths of the teachers suggested that the program would be improved if it offered trips to students to encourage them to enroll in the program and to attend the classes. An additional one-tenth of the supervisors and teachers felt that the program would be improved if it offered other types of incentives, such as certificates and tee-shirts.

B.S.A./C.C.P.

Classroom observations revealed that student instruction was individualized. The teachers also reported that they gave their students individually tailored assignments. In all the B.S.A./C.C.P. classes, teachers maintained folders on all the students, although these folders were usually not portfolios, in that most did not have multiple drafts of a single piece of work and did not have written work with the students' own comments.

B.S.A./C.C.P. teachers reported that the primary accomplishments of the program were its motivation of the students through individualized assignments and one-on-one and computer-assisted instruction, which led to a reduction in frustration, a decline in discipline problems, and an increase in attendance. According to the teachers, among the program's additional accomplishments were its success in raising students' reading and mathematics scores and increasing students' self-esteem.

Most of the teachers' suggestions for improving the program were related to use of the computers. Several teachers thought that the program should update computer resources, increase computer software, or provide separate rooms for traditional academic work and computer-assisted instruction.

ASHS Program

O.E.R. evaluators found that three of the six observed ASHS classes covered introduction to high school-level work to a great extent. During all or a portion of five of the six classes, students worked on individual assignments.

Of the 57 ASHS teachers who completed a questionnaire, the vast majority said they kept individual folders listing the students' plans and goals on a subject. Nearly three-fourths developed individual education plans for their students. Slightly more than one-half were assisted by an educational paraprofessional.

Large majorities of the program's teachers said that reading, mathematics, and writing workbooks and mathematics textbooks were available to them. Writing workbooks and readers

were available to more than one-half of the teachers. One-fourth had access to computers.

Questionnaire data showed that a majority of the teachers thought the ASHS program was effective in improving the students' confidence in their ability to obtain the G.E.D. and in motivating students to continue their education. Many also reported that the program was effective in improving both basic reading and basic mathematics skills, and said it was effective in motivating the students to improve their skills.

Nearly one-third of the teachers thought their primary accomplishment was helping students prepare for and pass the G.E.D. examination. An equal percentage felt that their primary accomplishment was helping the students acquire basic reading, mathematics, or writing skills.

Some teachers suggested that the program would be improved if, in the future, it provided more or appropriate resources, such as textbooks and workbooks. A few teachers felt that the program should provide more overhead projectors, computers, qualified or dedicated teachers, smaller classes, or more individualized instruction.

Basic Reading Program

Of the ten Basic Reading program classes observed by O.E.R. evaluators, six were held in the school libraries, two in traditional classrooms, and two in computer labs. The only or primary format for eight of the ten classes was students working individually. In the other two classes, the teacher lectured or

led class discussions. Among the activities in which the students engaged were reading books, utilizing the dictionary, and completing worksheets. The emphasis on reading was expected since the program was designed to address students' reading skills deficiencies. A majority of the classes also gave moderate to extensive coverage to writing activities.

Based on the teachers' responses on questionnaires, the Basic Reading program was successful in encouraging the students to stay in school, improving their ability to learn on their own, facilitating their academic achievement in other summer courses, facilitating their academic achievement in the coming school year, and teaching students library skills. The teachers felt that helping the students develop reading skills and improve their self-confidence and self-esteem were the major accomplishments of the Basic Reading program. They suggested that the program could be improved by providing books that were at an appropriate level for the students, especially for the students extremely deficient in reading skills and those born in a foreign country; by furnishing all necessary reading materials or giving money to teachers to purchase those materials; and by increasing the student enrollment, either by offering the program in every high school, creating two groups for each of the summer periods, or identifying more students at the junior high school level in need of remediation.

In general, the teachers thought the program was effective in improving the students' basic skills in reading, mathematics, and writing.

Project YOU

Although Project YOU teachers indicated that they thought the program was generally effective, and the object of the program was to improve the students' writing skills, only one of the three teachers who completed a questionnaire reported that writing workbooks and writing textbooks were available to them as resources. Of the remaining two teachers, one had mathematics workbooks, worksheets, and R.C.T. booklets available; the other teacher had only science workbooks which were used to prepare the students for the science R.C.T. Apparently, these latter two teachers concentrated on preparing their students to pass the R.C.T. in mathematics and science, respectively.

OVERALL

Based on class observations and teacher questionnaire data, O.E.R. evaluators found that the Chapter 1 summer programs promoted students' educational development by offering a variety of activities to enhance skills in supportive learning environments. Also, based on student data forms, which included attendance rates and improvement, if any, in basic skills O.E.R. found that some of the programs met, and others did not meet, their evaluation objectives. Considering these findings, O.E.R. makes the following recommendations:

- Should funds become available, consideration should be given to providing trips and other incentives as possible ways of improving student attendance in Project Welcome Plus/Study Skills in Communication Arts;

- Teacher training sessions should emphasize and encourage accurate completion of all student data forms to obtain the data necessary to measure the programs' evaluation objectives;

- Both the summer program's orientation effort and the curriculum guide should be reviewed as they relate to writing remediation, particularly in consideration of the fact that the program's goal and evaluation objective were to improve its students' writing skills; and

- Program administrators should give consideration and attention to Basic Reading program teachers' suggestion that books be provided at the appropriate levels for students who are extremely deficient in reading skills and for foreign-born students.

- If portfolios are to be used at all, they should contain a reflective component and multiple drafts of students' work rather than serve merely as assignment folders. Further, portfolios should be used as an assessment tool for teachers.